

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE DISTRICT OF SOUTH CAROLINA
FLORENCE DIVISION

Ronald Curtis Crider,)	Civil Action No.: 4:13-cv-489-RBH
)	
Plaintiff,)	
)	
v.)	ORDER
)	
Carolyn W. Colvin, Acting)	
Commissioner of Social Security)	
Administration,)	
)	
Defendant.)	
)	

Plaintiff Ronald Curtis Crider (“Plaintiff”) filed this appeal of the final decision of the Commissioner of the Social Security denying his claim for Disability Insurance Benefits and Supplemental Security Income. This matter is now before the Court for review of the Report and Recommendation (“R & R”) of United States Magistrate Judge Thomas E. Rogers, III, made in accordance with 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1) and Local Civil Rule 73.02(B)(2) for the District of South Carolina. *See* R & R, ECF No. 25. In the R & R, the Magistrate Judge recommends that the Court reverse the Commissioner’s decision and remand the matter for further administrative proceedings. *See id.* at 6.

The Magistrate Judge makes only a recommendation to this Court. The recommendation has no presumptive weight. The responsibility to make a final determination remains with this Court. *See Mathews v. Weber*, 423 U.S. 261, 270–71 (1976). The Court is charged with making a *de novo* determination of those portions of the R & R to which specific objection is made, and the Court may accept, reject, or modify, in whole or in part, the recommendation of the Magistrate Judge or recommit the matter with instructions. *See* 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1).

Neither party has filed objections to the R & R.¹ In the absence of objections to the R & R of the Magistrate Judge, this Court is not required to give any explanation for adopting the recommendation. *See Camby v. Davis*, 718 F.2d 198, 199 (4th Cir. 1983). The Court reviews only for clear error in the absence of an objection. *See Diamond v. Colonial Life & Accident Ins. Co.*, 416 F.3d 310 (4th Cir. 2005) (stating that “in the absence of a timely filed objection, a district court need not conduct *de novo* review, but instead must ‘only satisfy itself that there is no clear error on the face of the record in order to accept the recommendation’”) (quoting Fed. R. Civ. P. 72 advisory committee’s note).

After a thorough review of the record in this case, the Court finds no clear error. Accordingly, the R & R of the Magistrate Judge is adopted and incorporated by reference. Therefore, it is **ORDERED** that the Commissioner’s decision is **REVERSED** and the matter is **REMANDED** for further administrative proceedings.

IT IS SO ORDERED.

s/ R. Bryan Harwell
R. Bryan Harwell
United States District Judge

August 19, 2014
Florence, South Carolina

¹ On August 18, 2014, the Defendant specifically filed a notice that it would not file objections to the R & R. *See* Notice, ECF No. 27 at 1.